

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. In the above referenced Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2-6, 8, 10-19, and 22 under 35 USC § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Hewitt (U.S. Patent No. 5,796,851) in view of Kobayashi (U.S. Patent No. 5,764,005) and in further view of Yahagi (U.S. Patent No. 6,783,073). In addition, the Examiner rejected claims 7, 9, 13, 16, 20, and 21 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. These rejections have been traversed and, as such, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the allowability of claims 2-22.

2. Claims 7, 9, 13, 16, 20, and 21 have been rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph. The applicant has amended claims 7, 9, 13, 20, and 21 and cancelled claim 16 to overcome this rejection.

The applicant would like to draw the Examiner's attention to Figures 4 and 5 and the corresponding text of the present patent application for support of the amendment to these claims.

3. Claims 2-6, 8, 10-19, and 22 have been rejected under 35 USC § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Hewitt (U.S. Patent No. 5,796,851) in view of Kobayashi (U.S. Patent No. 5,764,005) and in further view of Yahagi (U.S. Patent No. 6,783,073). The applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection and the reasoning thereof.

Claims 6, 11, 18, and 22 have been amended to indicate that, when clamping of the output is activated, the output is clamped to a power return potential. Kobayashi does not teach or suggest such a clamping to a power return potential (e.g., ground), which effectively prevents a signal of any significant magnitude from being outputted. In contrast, Kobayashi teaches a clipping circuit which allows a signal to be outputted, but with a clipped magnitude. Thus, the combined teachings of Hewitt and Kobayashi fail to render claims 6, 11, 18, and 22 obvious.

Yahagi teaches at column 8, lines 51 – 65, that the correcting means 35, which includes the feedback clamped voltage generating circuit 33 as shown in Figure 7, can perform a feedback clamping control to make the level of the output signal obtained from the A/D converter 32 constant. For example, the (n)th value from the minimum output value of the ADC 32 may be used as the constant value. As such, Yahagi is teaching to clamp the output through a feedback circuit 33 to a value away from the minimum output value of the ADC 32. The present claims have the clamping circuit, when enabled, clamping the output to a power return potential.

Thus, the combined teachings of Hewitt, Kobayashi, and Yahagi fail to render claims 6, 11, 18, and 22 obvious.

The applicant believes that the reasons that distinguish claims 6, 11, 18, and 22 over the present rejection are applicable in distinguishing claims 2-5, 8, 10, 12-17, and 19 over the same rejection.

For the foregoing reasons, the applicant believes that claims 2-15, and 17-22 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that they be passed to allowance.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone or facsimile if the Examiner believes that such a communication would advance the prosecution of the present invention.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

By: /Timothy W. Markison reg. 33,534/
Timothy W. Markison
Phone: (808) 665-1725
Fax No. (808) 665-1728

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

37 C.F.R. 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Alexandria, Virginia 22303, on the date below:

4-18-06

Date

Niane Hudson

Signature